



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,700	07/08/2003	Jouji Wada	35847	9744

116 7590 01/12/2007  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP  
1801 EAST 9TH STREET  
SUITE 1200  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER	
CZEKAJ, DAVID J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/12/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/615,700	WADA, JOUJI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dave Czekaj	2621	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____                                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/12/03</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____                           |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sergeant et al. (5627616), (hereinafter referred to as "Sergeant") in view of Kawai (6414716).

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Sergeant discloses an apparatus that relates to surveillance camera systems (Sergeant: column 1, lines 4-5). This apparatus comprises "a camera unit for taking an image of an object" (Sergeant: figure 2), "a camera retaining assembly for retaining the camera, the camera being movable with respect to the retaining assembly to a destined position and posture" (Sergeant: figure 2, column 4, lines 58-67, wherein the pan and tilt assemblies move the camera), and "camera driving unit for driving the camera to move with respect to the retaining assembly" (Sergeant: figures 3-4, column 4, lines 58-67). However, this apparatus lacks the control units as claimed. Kawai teaches that prior art surveillance systems fail to provide clients with efficient and fair access to cameras (Kawai: column 1, lines 33-57). To help alleviate this problem, Kawai discloses "a micro computer unit for projecting a positional signal being operative to take two different states consisting of a regular state and an irregular state" (Kawai: column 11, lines 12-20, wherein the

Art Unit: 2621

irregular state is when the user selects the stop button which stops the transmission of position signals to the camera; column 11, lines 35-40, wherein the regular state is receiving the camera position signals from the user), "a camera drive control unit for driving the camera to move with respect to the retaining assembly, being operative to take two control states of which a first control state moves the camera to a destined position and a second control state under which the camera unit is driven to move into engagement with a resetting unit" (Kawai: column 11, lines 38-42, wherein the camera is reset to the initial camera position at the end of each session), and "setting the camera drive control unit to take a first control state when receiving the regular state signal while setting the drive control unit to take the second state when not receiving the regular state signal" (Kawai: column 11, lines 38-42, wherein the camera is driven to the initial state). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Sergeant and add the processing taught by Kawai in order to provide fair and reasonably access to a plurality of users.

Regarding claim 2, Kawai discloses "the camera has a surveillance area and a non-surveillance area" (Kawai: column 3, lines 47-50, wherein the surveillance area is the area where the image signal is produced; column 11, lines 38-42, wherein the non-surveillance area is the initial state of the camera wherein no images are taken).

Regarding claim 5, Kawai discloses "repeatedly setting the computer to take the regular and irregular states having different time intervals consisting of a first time in which the computer is set to take the regular mode and a second time in which the

Art Unit: 2621

computer is set to take the irregular mode” (Kawai: column 11, lines 38-42, wherein the internal computer in the camera takes both the regular and irregular modes; the time intervals is the time the user is using the camera, and the time the user clicks the stop button).

Regarding claim 6, Sergeant discloses “the retaining assembly includes a camera shaft having a camera revolution axis thereof, and a holder member for revolvably supporting the shaft and the shaft is driving in unison with the camera” (Sergeant: figures 2-4).

Regarding claim 7, Sergeant discloses “the retaining assembly includes a holder shaft which further comprises a stationary member, driving the holder member of the retaining assembly to revolve, and controlling the driving unit to have holder member revolve around axis with respect to stationary member” (Sergeant: figures 2-4).

Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sergeant et al. (5627616), (hereinafter referred to as “Sergeant”) in view of Kawai (6414716) in further view of Takagi et al. (6809760), (hereinafter referred to as “Takagi”).

Regarding claim 3, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, claim 3 differs from claim 1 in that claim 3 further requires measuring lap times. Takagi teaches that comparing times can be used to prevent processes from being endlessly repeated (Takagi: column 17, lines 1-11, wherein the first time is the standby time, the second time is the predetermined period of time). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

implement the time comparison taught by Takagi in order to prevent system resources from being misused.

Regarding claim 8, note the examiners rejections for claims 1-7.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US-6608649	08-2003	Suzuki et al.
US-6793414	09-2004	Akada
US-7151558	12-2006	Kogane et al.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DJC

  
MEHRDAD DASTOURI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TC 2600